

THE WHITE HOUSE
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

Minutes of Meeting

Corrected and Approved

Session: Eighth

Date: September 6 and 7, 1967

Place: September 6--Conference Room 1409
200 C Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C.

September 7--Chesapeake Room 1
Marriott Motor Hotel
Twin Bridges
Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

Minutes of Meeting

September 6-7, 1967

The Commission convened for its eighth meeting at 9:52 a. m. , on Wednesday, September 6 in Conference Room 1409 of the Food and Drug Administration Building, 200 C Street, S. W. , Washington, D. C. Mr. Dan Lacy, acting chairman, presided.

Commission Members present were:

Dr. Estelle Brodman
Dr. Frederick H. Burkhardt
Dr. Launor F. Carter
Mr. Verner W. Clapp
Mr. Carl Elliott
Dr. Alvin C. Eurich
Mrs. Mildred P. Frary
Dr. Herman H. Fussler
Mrs. Marian G. Gallagher
Mr. Emerson Greenaway
Dr. William N. Hubbard (Present September 6 only)
Mr. Dan Lacy (Acting Chairman)
Mrs. Merlin M. Moore
Dr. Carl F. J. Overhage
Mrs. George R. Wallace
Dr. Stephen J. Wright (Present September 6 only)

Absent were:

Dr. Douglas M. Knight (Chairman)
Dr. Harry H. Ransom
Dr. Wilbur L. Schramm

Also Present were:

Mr. Melville J. Ruggles, Executive Director
Dr. Daniel J. Reed, Deputy Director
Miss E. Shepley Nourse, Editor
Miss Mary Alice Hedge, Administrative Assistant
Miss Rita A. Lawrence, Secretary

Guests:

Wednesday, September 6, 1967

Miss Carolyn I. Whitenack
Associate Professor
Library and Audio Visual Education
Purdue University

Miss Mary H. Mahar
Chief of School Library Section
Acting Chief, Instruction Research Branch
U. S. Office of Education

Mr. William Knox
Vice-President
McGraw-Hill Company

Dr. J. Lee Westrate
Senior Management Analyst
Bureau of the Budget

Thursday, September 7, 1967

Dr. Louis B. Wright
Director
Folger Shakespeare Library

Executive Session

The proceedings came to order with Mr. Dan M. Lacy serving as acting chairman for the September 6 and 7 meetings, as requested by Dr. Douglas M. Knight, Chairman, who was absent. Mr. Lacy reported that Dr. Knight's illness will keep him on a restricted schedule through the early fall; it is still uncertain when he will be able to resume active chairmanship of the Commission. Mr. Lacy clarified that he was presiding for this meeting only, and mentioned that someone else would probably be designated Vice Chairman of the Commission to serve as acting chairman whenever Dr. Knight would be unable to be available. Before going on to introduce the school library specialists who were guests for the morning session, Mr. Lacy introduced Miss E. Shepley Nourse, who had recently joined the staff of the Commission as principal editor.

Mrs. Mildred P. Frary presented a series of slides illustrating some current approaches to the development of library experience from pre-school, through middle and upper grades, through junior and senior high school, to adult continuation programs. The slides indicated the trend toward broadly conceived instructional materials centers giving audiovisual materials, program kits, and other items accessible space with books (including not only the conventional cloth-bound book but also paperbacks and microform). Some solutions to the shelving problems created by this program approach were illustrated by the slides. The current importance of instructional materials centers is highlighted by Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides funds for materials--school library resources that include more than texts, but not equipment or buildings. Mrs. Frary mentioned that there is need to strengthen state departments of education. Under this legislation, funds go from the Office of Education to state departments of education and implementation is through the states; it is assumed there is a state planning tie-in with the National Defense Education Act. It was noted that private schools are included in the program, but technically this occurs in an "on-loan" basis from the public school district.

Miss Carolyn Whitenack from Purdue presented a series of slides showing floor plans and various views of some model instructional materials centers. The intent was to show how developments such as an all-carrel team-teaching library has implications for the education of the school librarian of the future. The school librarian is an agent of change who should be an educational media specialist, with the values of any teacher and should

be the product of a multidisciplinary education. At Purdue, a prospective school librarian studies a subject field, the teacher--preparation offerings, and media specialization--the program encompasses five years and six years for supervisory eligibility. The students study the organization of materials rather than cataloging; unity of materials is stressed and the school librarian's role is to co-direct learning with teachers. The tendency is to think of learning itself in a broad sense--e. g., an elementary school pupil can teach parents, even teachers. In some discussion following the presentation, it was emphasized that the protective librarian is out; the new emphasis is on use of materials and on careful planning to avoid excessive damage and loss, and to provide efficient maintenance of equipment.

Miss Mary Helen Mahar, the second guest of the morning, participated throughout all preceding discussions with respect to Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. She believed one weakness was the scarcity of manpower, since the legislation provides no funds for personnel. She believed that there should be coordination with the NDEA to avoid a segmented approach to the development of equipment, personnel, and materials.

The Commission took formal action approving the minutes of the Commission meetings for March, April, May and June, 1967. It was clarified that all approved minutes were held open for possible later change.

There was a hand-out to the Commission members listing the schedule for these grass-roots visits planned by Mr. Carl Elliott and Mrs. Merlin M. Moore. The progress report indicated plans were well under way, with as many as thirty witnesses in some locales, and local committees at work. It has been arranged that summaries of each of the hearings will be prepared and distributed to the Commission members. The members were asked to fill in the hand-out indicating which of the several regional hearings they would be able to attend.

Lunch

The Commission Members recessed for lunch at
12:30 p. m.

Interviews

Mr. William Knox, Vice President, McGraw-Hill Company,
and Dr. J. Lee Westrate, Senior Management Analyst, Bureau
of the Budget.

The Commission was reconvened at 2:30 p. m. in Conference Room 1409 of the Food and Drug Administration Building. The Chairman welcomed two guest witnesses, both of whom were instrumental in the creation of the Commission. First to speak was Mr. William Knox, formerly Chairman of COSATI in the Executive Office of the President and presently a Vice President of McGraw-Hill Company. The other witness was Dr. J. Lee Westrate, formerly in the office of the Special Assistant to the President and, for the past five years, Senior Management Analyst with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Knox observed that the early thinking which preceded the Commission's creation centered around the major involvement of libraries in the total information network in this country and the need for analysis of library activity as a social function, as a discrete entity activity within our society. In particular, it was recognized that library activities were a major part in our space, science, and technology programs. He explained that the original space and science programs were so structured that very basic questions could be effectively resolved. In a similar manner, it occurred to many that there existed a need for an organization of capable people to examine the basic program of the nation's libraries, what they hope to achieve through our resources and how best to go about achieving it.

Dr. Westrate recalled that his first memory of the Commission was a memorandum from Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. to President Kennedy inquiring as to the feasibility of a national inquiry into libraries. The President solicited the views of the Bureau of the Budget. The matter was further discussed at a White House Conference on Libraries in January of 1963. Recognizing that something over \$600 million was being spent by the Federal government on libraries, it was decided that a National Commission for Libraries should be created. In January of 1966 a number of meetings were held among interested federal officers, including Bill Knox and Doug Cater. Doug Cater drafted a summary

of these conversations and, as a result, the President, in signing the L.S.C.A. amendments on July 20th of 1966, announced that he would create a Commission to advise himself and the Secretary of H.E.W. regarding library matters. Because it was necessary to fund this new work through some special appropriations for H.E.W., it was decided to create the Inter-Agency Committee on Libraries. The dual arrangement resolves both the legal requirements for such action and also attaches the project to its proper funding source. He further observed that the Commission remains primarily responsible to the President, and the Inter-Agency Committee shall bring a specific body of opinion to react to and to act on the Commission's recommendations.

The Chairman observed that a number of other agencies, including COSATI and the American Library Association, had expressed interest in such a body as far back as 1960. He inquired if all of these agencies had, in some way, all interacted in bringing about the Commission. It was agreed that there was a confluence of ideas and all merged in agreement on the creation of the Commission.

Mr. Knox stated that the primary goal of the Commission would be that of identifying the overall objectives for the libraries in this country. It should determine what kinds of services libraries should perform and also how these may be integrated with other parts of the information world. Such considerations should include the mass media, the specialized publications and all the other means by which information is conveyed from its source to its application. The Commission should also recommend the mechanisms and the approaches to be used to achieve these objectives that it will have determined. It should attempt to identify the fundamental assumptions on which a national library program might be founded. In this era of revolutionary technology, it clearly must be determined what implications such a revolution holds for our libraries. It is widely believed that they are destined for radical change in the future and the character of that change must be projected. On the other hand, it must be decided what of the traditional role of libraries must be retained and improved. In an age when information and communication are paramount, a method must be found to attract and serve both the literate and the illiterate. The library's contribution toward the solutions of such problems as urbanism, learning, research,

and of the interaction of people of all walks of life, must be resolved. From these two concepts, that of the traditional role of libraries and the emerging possibilities, can evolve a wide range of choice for establishing goals for a national library program. After establishing such objectives it would be determined if the existing mechanisms, such as library associations, independent foundations dealing with library programs, commercial, information-transfer people and the like, are sufficient and adequate to the task ahead.

Dr. Westrate added that in establishing the Commission it was agreed that an evaluation was needed for public, educational, and research libraries, including the federal libraries and library programs. Also, study should be directed to the relationship between the federal government, its libraries and library and the nation's library resources. Too, the need and potential for technological innovation in library service should be evaluated. Manpower and conflict methods in libraries seemed very large problems deserving study. A major consideration should be that of determining the success and efficiency of present government efforts in behalf of libraries. Recommendations should center on the means by which all library programs can be brought to maximum effectiveness, whether public library, university library, federal library or other. Finally, the Commission should spell out concise, specific recommendations on how best the government can bring its best influence in behalf of a national library program.

In reply to questions, principally from Dr. Hubbard, Mrs. Gallagher, and Mrs. Moore, regarding some specific assignments for the Commission, Dr. Westrate stated that he felt that the degree of success which the Commission will attain will depend heavily upon how well they are able to succinctly state the fundamental issues and problems. He felt too that the Commission would be of great service in clarifying where possible, whether they were addressing their recommendations to the federal, state, or local governments, or all three. He recommended that the Commission create a body of information, a body of data, which can be used as a springboard for action by the ordinary processes of government. He felt that, after issues are identified, priorities should be established and guidelines for further development in governmental processes should be indicated. The role of the Library of Congress should be firmly resolved, as regards the national library concept. The Commission would be wise to speak directly to the question of state libraries and their role, as well as to the question of court libraries, both federal and local. He felt, too, that the Commission should resolve immediately the question of the length of their (the Commission) duration of existence.

Again, replying to questions, Dr. Westrate reminded Commission members that they shall have to deal realistically with the problem of how to implement their recommendations. If they wish to recommend establishing a national library agency, with advisory or actual powers, it must determine whether they feel this could best be done under the executive branch of government or the legislative. It must resolve the question of the Library of Congress and its relationship to any new agency or activities. It must recognize that at the present the responsibilities for informational and library activities in the country are divided among a substantial number of different kinds of agencies, funded in different ways--private, grant, federal, state, and other. He indicated that a number of precedents exist for establishing a bridging mechanism between a legislative agency and the executive agency. There exists other cases where such sharing of responsibilities between the two branches was worked out on an informal and uneven basis. He cautioned, however, that any recommendations regarding dual responsibility would certainly raise some practical problems for some federal officers and officials. Finally, he stated that, while the Commission should employ its full imagination in preparing its recommendations, careful attention should be applied to seeing that the recommendations remain as precise, specific and practical as possible.

Dr. Westrate stated that the Library has been quite successful under the legislative arm of government. He felt that over the years the Library of Congress has been able to render a number of services which might be considered national in nature. He referred specifically to its many repository responsibilities and its leadership contribution to the library community as a whole. He suggested that for the Library of Congress to be asked to assume a role of a national library in its full context, and for it remain, as is likely, under the legislative arm of government, would make it quite awkward for the President to effectively promote the Commission's recommendations. He expressed his view that the Library of Congress was capable of only a limited role and that, without attendant organizational recommendations for the institution, he would recommend that the Commission question seriously the advisability of such a plan for a national library.

Mr. Elliott suggested a solution might exist in renaming the Library of Congress, "The Library of Congress, the National Library." He felt that retaining the name might appease some of the critics in Congress. He felt too that a bridging mechanism could be worked out whereby the funding and authority for the Legislative Reference Service would remain with the legislative branch, while all of the newer activities involving a national library concept could be transferred to the executive.

Dr. Westrate recognized that the Commission might not be able to complete its labors by December 1967. He explained that the time limit was quite arbitrary and was intended only to spur action. If the Commission feels it will require more time, such a request should be forwarded. He explained that this could be accomplished by simple amendment to the Executive Order.

The Chairman then asked that the remainder of this session be devoted exclusively to consideration of the final document of the Commission. He suggested that six major areas of concern must be decided by the Commission: 1) physical format; 2) the audience to whom the report will be addressed; 3) the level of the report's argument; 4) the organization of the document; 5) who will write it and how it will be written; and 6) scheduling of the Commission's deliberations toward a fixed calendar date.

Length and Form of Final Document

The Chairman suggested that three distinct possibilities existed regarding the length and form of the Commission's report. First, a brief summary report polished and ready for publication. Second, a long report incorporating all of the material amassed by the Commission and prepared for transmittal to the Inter-Agency Library Committee. And third, an intermediate report of short book length that would be suitable for publication in the form transmitted to the Committee and the White House, with attendant supporting material to appear at a later date in a different format.

Dr. Hubbard supported the view that two volumes would be required. The first to contain a crisp statement of recommendations which would be understandable and usable by the appropriate agencies of government. A second volume would contain a massive amount of suitable background material. Only this format would, he felt, be meaningful to forthcoming budget deliberations.

Similarly, Mr. Elliott supported the notion of a first volume of fifty to seventy-five pages containing findings and recommendations. Two additional volumes should contain complete evidentiary supporting material.

Dr. Eurich and Dr. Haskins felt that twenty or twenty-five pages would be adequate for recommendations. Additional material could be issued at a later date, perhaps after the presently scheduled deadline of the Commission.

Dr. Wright cautioned against issuing a document that was designed only to achieve brevity. He felt that once the trivia had been eliminated, the report should be the length that it requires.

Organization of Material in Report

The Chairman recommended that the organization of the report not become the prisoner of the present administrative organization of libraries. He felt some broad topics should be developed, such as library services to formal education, services to the general public, research agencies, and so forth. To this would be added general topics that cut across all library activities, such as manpower, library education, federal assistance programs, and the like. Mr. Elliott, Dr. Hubbard and Dr. Wright agreed in spirit with this approach. Dr. Wright added that he felt that it would be wise to arrive at a limited set of broad recommendations, perhaps ten, and center the major part of the first report around these broad statements.

Level of Report's Findings

The Chairman observed that the report could either list a number of vast generalities and platitudes or, on the other hand, it could set forth specific recommendations in great practical detail. Each approach has the danger, respectively, of being either too general to be immediately meaningful or, of becoming so burdened with arguments of specific accomplishment that the observable goals will become obscured. He suggested that the most agreeable approach might be to issue fairly specific solutions where this appears possible and to describe broad problems requiring attention, where solutions do not easily emerge.

A number of Commission members expressed agreement with this but suggested that as many recommendations for implementation be included as possible.

Audience of the Report

The Chairman stated that the Commission must direct the majority of their recommendations to the federal government for action through federal agencies and programs. He suggested that many recommendations might also be addressed to state and local governments, and foundations as well. He reminded the Commission that two successful earlier studies, the Public Library Inquiry and the Flexner report, addressed their findings to the profession itself.

Dr. Fussler expressed the view, echoed by many members, that the burden of the document's message should be directed to the federal government and should be written accordingly.

Actual Writing of Final Document

The Chairman reminded the Commission that Dr. Knight had suggested that the Commission be divided into task forces, or subcommittees, each charged with reviewing specific sections of the ultimate document. Dr. Hubbard supported the idea of the Commission compiling the final report through task force working papers. Dr. Wright disagreed, feeling that the staff should draft the conclusions evident on the major considerations. The draft should then be considered by the entire Commission for final form and polishing. Dr. Fussler concurred in this latter view and added that he felt that the task forces might be useful instruments in reviewing drafts of major topics as they are received.

Scheduling of Deliberations and Issuance of Final Document

The Chairman noted some of the members feel that an extension of time will be required to complete the Commission's work. On the other hand, it seemed that the White House had expressed the hope that the original schedule might be met. Too, he pointed out that both Mr. Ruggles and Dr. Reed have commitments to return to their permanent positions by a predetermined date. In any case, the decision for an extension should be made prior to November.

Dr. Eurich favored completion of the Commission's statement by December. If an additional amount of time is required, it may be used to work on supplementary reports.

Dr. Hubbard felt that only by completing the report by December could the Commission hope that the document might have some impact on impending budget deliberations.

Dr. Fussler disagreed, saying that most of the budgeting process is completed by December. Therefore, the document should be on the eloquence and persuasiveness of the statement, rather than date of issue.

The Commission recessed until 8:45 p. m. , at the South Room of the Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel on U. S. Route 1, Arlington, Virginia.

At 8:45 p. m. , Wednesday, September 6, 1967, the Commission reconvened in the South Room of the Marriott Motor Hotel. The early part of the meeting on Wednesday evening was devoted to discussion of forthcoming trips for local hearings. The Chairman referred all details to Miss Mary Allen.

General Outline, Concept, and Table of Contents of Report

Dr. Eurich expressed the view that the Commission has the unusual historic opportunity to create a guiding set of recommendations and principles which may have enduring effect upon the development of American libraries for the next half-century or so. Recognizing this opportunity, he and Mrs. Moore has composed a set of six basic principles which they felt should be in the formal document:

1. The enunciation of a national policy on libraries which would, in spirit, assure a high standard of library service to all people of the nation.
2. The creation of a continuing national agency to assure that the above set of principles are effectively brought to reality.
3. Assure that federal government provide the necessary support to the states in order that each state agency can become an effective organization in developing improved library service.
4. Assert the overriding importance of manpower in any effort toward strengthening of library services; selection, recruitment, and training of manpower.
5. Elaboration of a program for improved library services which the federal government can implement with a major thrust of power and guidance. This program necessarily incorporates the, as yet, undetermined possibilities of advancing technology.

6. The conversion of the Library of Congress to the status of a complete national library.

Dr. Eurich explained that he felt that only through the issuance of such a statement of principles, necessarily broad enough to remain relevant in generations to come, could the Commission fulfill its basic and historic assignment.

Dr. Fussler agreed, but added that he felt that such a statement of general principles must be supported by a substantial body of technical and factual data. He felt that this format was emerging as a consensus of the Commission.

Dr. Burkhardt felt strongly that the report should not be confined to just a statement of general principles. All agreed.

The Chairman summarized what appeared to be the three possible alternatives which the Commission might consider in constructing their report:

1. Write a report of enduring validity which establishes goals of library service and defines federal responsibilities for contributing toward this ultimate goal;

2. Establish long-range objectives which would be so structured so as to facilitate resulting legislation in Congress;

3. Recognize the immediate library situation and outline a course of action for the government which would be applicable to the immediate future, perhaps the next half-decade.

Mr. Lacy, the Chairman, explained that these are not altogether exclusive of each other.

Dr. Carter expressed his admiration for Dr. Eurich's statement of principles but felt they should be supported by a lengthy analysis of the attendant implications and implementations.

Dr. Brodman suggested that the Commission follow the precedent of earlier studies: first express known eternal verities, support these with essential data and add recommendations for implementations.

It was Mr. Elliott's view that the report should not be too specific concerning implementation, for this would appear to be a decision for the President and his capable advisors.

Dr. Fussler outlined a proposal for the format of the report which the Chairman summarized: an open (or closing) chapter of principles along the outlines which Dr. Eurich suggested; a series of short chapters on specific topics, such as manpower, technology and others; and, a third body of supporting data which might be otherwise published or simply filed and cited. Mr. Ruggles added his support to this plan, as did many others. It was agreed by the Chairman, Mr. Ruggles, and others that a list of principles and a grouping of topics would be prepared for the following meeting. Dr. Fussler suggested that the list of topics, once agreed upon by the Commission, could become a tentative list of chapter headings.

Mr. Elliott moved, with Dr. Haskins seconding, that the report be confined to fifty pages or less.

The Chairman called for a consensus on the proposal that the report be designed for a size of approximately fifty pages and that it contain a summary chapter, either by way of introduction or conclusion, perhaps eight or ten pages, that might be separately printed with just recommendations. After hearing additional opinions regarding format, the Chairman first pointed out that he was acting only in behalf of the permanent Chairman and that all consent would necessarily be tentative. He then called for agreement on a plan for the report. Under the suggested plan the report would embrace a statement of principles and these would be supported by courses of action which would be discussed by topic. He suggested that these topics be considered and organized in appropriate clusters. Such clusters might include: libraries in formal education (schools, universities, research, and so forth), libraries serving the general public, libraries serving specialized social needs (as the poverty program), and a general heading of major aspects of library operation (manpower, technology, construction, resources, and so on) with each one to be measured against the requirements of the different kinds of libraries.

Mr. Ruggles affirmed his belief that such a plan was a workable one and one for which the staff would be able to supply outline material which the Commission might use as a departure point for further refinement. He added that he felt that the disposition of the additional data supplied through the technical studies might be delayed until a future date. He added that such material would be of great interest to the profession and might be made available to the library schools through the Office of Education and the ERIC system.

Dr. Eurich outlined his statement of six principles which can be found on pages 12 and 13.

Dr. Overhage expressed the view that procedure had been discussed at great length, but that content had been less well explored. He felt that the Commission must first determine what it intends to say before it decides on the format in which it will be expressed.

Mr. Ruggles reminded the members that over the past nine months a great amount of rich ideas and creative recommendations regarding libraries had been expressed by both Commission members and by those who have testified before the group. He felt that this wealth of materials should be incorporated into the final report. He added that a few problems facing libraries are fairly restricted in their difficulty and that agreement could easily be reached among Commission members as to their recommendations and that these items would certainly belong in the report. He cited the preservation of paper as one such example. He noted that two difficult problems which will certainly deserve discussion in the final report are the establishment of a permanent Commission, or like agency, and the status of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Overhage recommended that an expert of outstanding ability be asked to compile what appear to be consensus of recommendations of the Commission and that these be reviewed by the Commission with the expert, who will then prepare a first draft of the document for further refinement.

Mr. Elliott moved that the Chairman appoint a Committee of three, preferably outside the Commission, to prepare a working document based upon the testimony and the studies, as well as the Commission's own materials, which can be reviewed by the Commission at its October meeting. He added that the staff should work with this appointed Committee, making available their knowledge and understanding toward the refinement of the document.

Dr. Schramm suggested that an individual, either a Commission member or an expert in the field, prepare summary statements on the technical papers which already exist. These summaries could then be reviewed by a subcommittee of the Commission or perhaps three to five members. This refined draft could then be submitted to the full Commission for further discussion. At the conclusion of this process, all of these statements could be incorporated into a first draft of the final document.

Dr. Hubbard agreed that such reports should be prepared, but felt that these could be prepared by the staff, with the assistance of the Commission members. Dr. Burkhardt, Mr. Carter, Mr. Greenaway and the Chairman concurred in this suggestion.

Mr. Ruggles expressed his confidence that the staff could satisfactorily fulfill this assignment and would welcome the opportunity.

Dr. Fussler inquired as to how rapidly the staff might prepare summary reports on individual studies. Mr. Ruggles stated some could be available for the next meeting, October 9. The extent and number of such reports will depend extensively upon how promptly they are received. The first draft of the final report is scheduled for December 15, at the latest.

After discussion it was agreed that the Commission would next convene, October 9, 10, and 11, 1967. Accepting the invitation of Dr. Haskins, the Commission will meet at the Carbegle Institution of Washington. The hotel accommodations for this meeting will be arranged at the Dupont Plaza.

The Commission recessed at 10:30 p.m., until 9:30 a. m. the following day, September 7, 1967.

The Commission reconvened at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 7, 1967, in the Chesapeake No. 1 Room of the Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel.

After introducing Dr. Taylor Cole of Duke University and after asking him about the health of Dr. Knight, the Chairman devoted the entire meeting to review, by the Monitoring Committees, of the research and technical studies which the Commission has authorized. They were considered individually.

1. IMPACT OF SOCIAL CHANGE ON LIBRARIES.

The Chairman reported that this study would be completed within the week and that the first draft appears quite good. The basic plan is to summarize principal elements of social change and to discuss their implication for libraries. The result of an extensive questionnaire addressed to a selected list of librarians will also be included.

2. **USE OF LIBRARIES.** Dr. Eurich reported that this study should be completed by the end of September and that no advance summary is available.

3. **LIBRARY ECONOMICS.** The Chairman expressed his view that this is a first-rate study. The major emphasis is centered on public libraries, though other types of libraries are dealt with less extensively.

4. **LIBRARY STATISTICS.** Dr. Carter suggested that this study was superficial. He felt that the Commission had received their dollar value for the report, but it would likely be of little value to the Commission's deliberations. Mr. Ruggles explained that a second draft was promised. All Commission members expressed the hope that a second draft might add more depth to the study.

5. **LIBRARY MANPOWER.** Dr. Brodman reported that this study had not been received. At present, Eli Ginzberg (project chairman) has had little opportunity to deal with the study and has assigned the bulk of the research to his assistant, Miss Carol Brown. The Monitoring Committee has attempted to provide Miss Brown with some guidance regarding the study. Mr. Ruggles noted that Mr. Ginzberg's credentials in the field of manpower were most impressive and that the price of the study was very slight, which might account for the slow pace of accomplishment in the report.

6. **LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES.** This report is complete. Dr. Fussler explained that this study had been undertaken without cost and that it was intended for a very specialized purpose. The study does provide a thoughtful estimation of the effects of new technology on planning for new library construction. This, however, is the extent of the report. It is not a report on building design, convention architectural problems and other such matters.

7. **TECHNOLOGY AND LIBRARIES.** Dr. Brodman appraised the report as an excellent one. She explained that it advances three specific possibilities for technological development in libraries: 1) do nothing and allow such developments to occur naturally; 2) to advance a national plan and attempt to implement it; and, 3) select specific projects for implementation which shall have an impact on the national library community. She concurred

with the last option. The report also indicates that the total problem is one of such a magnitude that only the federal government can supply adequate planning and funding. Mrs. Moore noted that specific recommendations regarding state libraries in this matter had been omitted and requested that they be included. Dr. Carter indicated that this suggestion would be given consideration.

8. LIBRARIES AND INDUSTRIES. Mr. Ruggles explained that, due to the pressure of other duties, this assignment had been transferred to Mr. Charles Bourne. The first draft of the study had been unsatisfactory. A later meeting of the Advisory Committee had produced many useful suggestions. Additional work by both the Committee and Mr. Bourne should result in a much improved final report.

9. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LIBRARIES. Mr. Cole explained that specific aspects of this broad and difficult topic had been assigned to capable research experts. The final report will be brief and will include recommendations contained in the fuller research studies. Replying to a question by Dr. Carter, Mr. Cole explained that the final report would touch on the two broad topics of the establishment of a national library administration and the proper role and relationship of the Library of Congress. Replying to a question by Dr. Fussler, Mr. Cole replied that the report would not attempt a full legislative history regarding libraries, but would include a summary statement regarding federal legislation and its impact on libraries. The Chairman suggested that Mr. Robert Frase might be asked for recommendations on such ancillary matters as postal rates, tax policy, copyright, tariffs, and others. Mr. Cole replied that he would be devoting some thought to the international relations of libraries.

10. PUBLIC LIBRARIES. Mr. Greenaway explained that the study was not complete and appeared to be somewhat behind schedule. He had spoken with the team doing the report and had found that a good plan of approach had been devised. He asked, however, that the contractor be urged to supply a first draft, for review by the Monitoring Committee, before final publications.

11. STATE LIBRARIES. Mrs. Moore reported that this work was incomplete. However, both the Advisory Committee and the Monitoring Committee had met and made some progress. It is her view that an excellent outline has been assembled and that the resulting study will cover all the immediate issues, including that of the need for mandating at the state level.

At this point, Mr. Greenaway expressed the view that all the reports on the kinds of libraries were, by reason of inadequate time for in-depth research, necessarily only superficial conclusions. Mr. Ruggles agreed but pointed out that the Office of Education was clearly interested in these reports and has expressed their intention to use them as a springboard for more sophisticated studies to be issued by their office. In this sense they produce initiative and are, therefore, useful.

12. COLLEGE LIBRARIES. Mr. Clapp reported that the study was incomplete, but that a mimeographed report had been issued and would soon be distributed. The report will not produce original research or new data. He explained that a fine Advisory Committee had been gathered and had met once. It was the Monitoring Committee's conclusions that: 1) a sound plan for the report had been devised, even if new light on new topics was conspicuously absent; 2) the contractor seems to have an adequate grasp of the problems, and a good report should be provided the Commission; and, 3) the Committee will be able to determine little else until the first draft is received September 7. The final report is due the last day of September. Mr. Ruggles noted that the contractor is obligated to provide a summary of the report and that he would call this clause to their attention.

13. SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Mrs. Frary stated that an equally competent Advisory Committee had been congregated and had designed an acceptable plan of approach for the study. The Nelson team had spent the early part of their work in basic indoctrination on the subject of school libraries, but seemed now well on their way to producing an adequate statement for the Commission's review.

14. RESEARCH LIBRARIES. Dr. Burkhardt explained that the report attempts to cover all subject specialities of special libraries. A number of large topic areas have been assigned to competent individuals on the Committee. These subject assignments include: preamble, basic recommendations, access and dissemination of knowledge, technology, federal and research libraries, and copyright. The report shall include findings on manuscript and archival collections as well. The Committee hopes to have a completed study available by early October.

15. SPECIAL LIBRARIES. Dr. Overhage reported that the report is due in September. The report shall consist of three parts: reports by experts on specific topics, a statistical survey of existing special libraries, and the testimony of the excellent Advisory Committee. It is the feeling of the Advisory Committee that the direction of the study will be responsive to the work statement of the original contract. He added that some remarks regarding the imbalance of information and materials exchange between strong and weak special libraries will be included.

16. INTER-LIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKS. Dr. Overhage explained that, while the report was incomplete, a very promising piece of material may be developed. The major implications of the report will be that any network system of libraries must be evolutionary rather than arise from a freshly conceived national, master plan. Regional and cooperative attempts may evolve into an effective network, but a mammoth plan for all libraries of the nation is unrealistic. He noted that a young inventor had introduced a new concept for transmission of video facsimiles for library networks, but expressed the Monitoring Committee's view that such untested ideas may have little significance to the Commission's report. There followed a lengthy discussion regarding the exact meaning of "network" and it was agreed that the Commission would need to clarify the different types of information exchange and resources sharing activities which are now being attempted by libraries. It was further agreed that, based upon present technology and actual needs, networks were not, perhaps, the panacea they first appeared to represent.

17. EXTRA-LIBRARY INFORMATION DISSEMINATION SYSTEMS. The Chairman observed that the contractor for this topic appeared extraordinarily capable and that an excellent Advisory Committee had been assembled. The study is intended to analyze the type of information storage and retrieval operations, analogous to libraries, that are being conducted in institutions and environments outside the immediate library community. It is hoped that the report will include recommendations relative to such operations which might be encouraged and enlarged, to those which might be better conducted within the library community, and to information activities conducted in the library community which might be better handled by this outside environment. Also, some

decisions should be forthcoming regarding the applicability of techniques of extra-library systems to library purposes. The study will be based primarily on case studies, such as the Census Bureau's system, or that of the American Chemical Society.

Lunch

The Commission recessed for lunch at 12:00 noon.

On Format

The Commission reconvened at 2:18 p. m. in the Chesapeake No. 1 Room of the Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel.

Throughout the early portion of the meeting, the Commission turned its attention to recommendations regarding the format which the Commission's report should assume. The Chairman recapitulated the consensus that the ultimate report of the Commission should exceed no more than fifty pages in length. He further ascertained agreement that the Chairman, of the Acting Chairman, working in conjunction with the staff, would make assignment for producing reports which would be reviewed, and approved by the full Commission at future meetings. Such reports shall, where appropriate, be incorporated into the final report.

The Chairman then commented upon two documents which had been distributed to the Commission. One document, written by Dr. Eurich, was highly commended by Commission members and suggested as a fine document which might well serve as an example for setting out a statement of principles to be contained in the opening chapter of the Commission's ultimate report. The second document, written by the Chairman, was suggested as a preliminary outline for the Commission's remarks regarding the problems that are currently before the government and society.

Following this line of comment, Dr. Carter added that, a report of approximately fifty pages following the outline suggested in the two distributed documents, and as appropriately modified, should be followed by supplements, whether attached or separate, which would deal in greater detail with some of the topics.

Mr. Ruggles called attention to the fact that, at this point, the Commission has not agreed upon a plan for the development of the Commission's report--especially the separate special studies. As an example, he asked guidance regarding a possible condensed version of each individual study which will form the appendices. Following discussion, it was agreed that condensation of each study would be both impossible and impractical.

Writing the Document.

The discussion turned from the format to the practical aspects of writing the document. The Chairman asserted the belief that no committee can write a report. Regarding the document under discussion, the Chairman expressed the opinion that the Commission's role would be that of a critical and editorial review board. That is, the Commission will review drafts of the report, and its parts, and offer guidance, suggestions for improvement, amendments, and, if the report is ultimately unsatisfactory, return the report for a new approach. He expressed the hope that this critical work of the Commission might begin in October with the submission by the staff of preliminary material for review.

Dr. Fussler, with others, reiterated the consensus that the ultimate document should be constructed around the framework of the two outlines now before the Commission.

The Chairman called upon each Commission member to stand ready to assist the staff in their preparation of the document as it develops, unit by unit.

Major Emphasis of Document's Recommendations.

The Chairman reminded the members that the President, in creating the Commission, had clearly indicated the need of the Commission to develop recommendations regarding a more effective role of the Federal Government in the improvement of the nation's library resources. He called for an expression of feeling regarding an interpretation of this directive.

Dr. Reed suggested that, rather than limit the considerations to that of the role of the Federal government, the Commission might prefer to approach the question, "The Role of Government." In this way, government at all levels--federal, state, and local--and their appropriate responsibilities to library programs, could be evaluated simultaneously.

Dr. Overhage, Mr. Greenaway, the Chairman, and others commented on this question and agreed that the Federal government could not be studied exclusive of other agencies. Mr. Greenaway pointed out that a number of libraries, e. g., school, college, and community college, are funded almost exclusively by state funds. On the other hand, most public libraries are supported in the main by locally appropriated funds.

The Chairman again expressed his view that the principal charge of the Commission is that of forwarding recommendations regarding what the Federal government should do in behalf of the nation's libraries, and how might the government achieve more effectiveness and efficiency in its existing library agencies and programs. Mrs. Gallagher asked if it were not possible to satisfy this Executive Order without, at the same time, seeming to overlook the responsibilities of the state and local governments. Other members commented upon other complicating features to this question: imbalance of matching funds, unequal development of libraries among the states, the question of "national" libraries, and other difficulties. Mrs. Moore and Dr. Brodman chorused their opinion that all three levels of government, and the interaction of all three, should be discussed within studies of individual topics. Dr. Brodman brought the discussion to a close by suggesting that Mr. Lacy's outline form the axis of the report. She directed attention to the organization of Mr. Lacy's plan, which included discussion of a number of broad topics, with a final chapter devoted to "the Federal or the government interface." Other members concurred in this recommendation.

Subject and Content of Document.

Dr. Brodman renewed her recommendation that Mr. Lacy's general outline be adopted as an acceptable plan for the report. She reviewed the topics to be discussed: "Libraries and Education"; "Libraries and Research"; "Libraries and the Professions"; "Libraries and the Public"; "Manpower"; "New Technology"; and "The Federal of the Government Interface."

Mrs. Moore agreed on the worth of Mr. Lacy's outline, but asked that the material written by Dr. Eurich, and distributed to the Commission, be included as well. She asked Dr. Eurich to review this material for the Commission.

Dr. Eurich explained that the bulk of his material was intended as prefatory or first chapter material. It was his hope that these ideas might set the tone and need for the remainder of the document. The overall attempt is to define the present day library and what it can provide. The library should be identified as a basic resource for developing the intellectual life of the nation. The library can assist in knitting together the outlying sections of the country with the rapidly expanding urban centers. The specialized functions and capabilities of our various types of library will be even more valuable in the future years. In sum, the library is an essential resource for the endless frontier, or for our search for improved understanding throughout the world. Recognizing this need for expanded library service, the President created this National Advisory Commission. The Commission has spent several hard months, with hearings throughout the country and through the study of specialized materials, in the hope that with this experience they may be able to spur certain broad advances in library development. This, said Dr. Eurich, should be the tone of our opening chapter.

Moving on to specific recommendations, Dr. Eurich explained that his suggestions revolve around six basic concepts. These six broad ideas should be brought forward in the early part of the document:

- 1) The pressing need for library policy developed at the national level.
- 2) To achieve the above, the creation of a permanent, National Library Commission.
- 3) The need for a National Library as part of the national commitment..
- 4) Federal sponsorship of a national network of libraries.
- 5) Efforts to curb the incredible shortage of manpower in the profession.
- 6) Federal sponsorship of program to exploit the many opportunities available through the new technologies.

Mr. Greenaway suggested that the report discuss not only the changes and the needed changes in the library world, but the factors which have or will contribute to these changes as well. The factors appear to fall under four general headings. First, the technological developments that have had a tremendous bearing on libraries. Secondly, the significance of the education explosion in all of its ramifications. Third, the dramatic social changes occurring throughout the country. And finally, the new Federal involvement at all levels of research, education and libraries.

Dr. Brodman felt that, in any event, the report should contain three essential points. First, the recognition by the Commission that the library represents a viable means for the future as well as for the present for the transfer of information and therefore should be strengthened and helped. Secondly, the Commission can not recognize all of the library's problems, much less uncover solutions, in one year and, therefore, the Commission, or some similar body, should be continued indefinitely under Federal sponsorship. Finally, that a national library should be created or designated and a detailed list of national level functions be assigned to it.

Disposition of Contracted Studies and Supplementary Testimony.

Turning next to the seventeen technical studies commissioned as basic research material, Dr. Carter expressed the view that they should be issued as supplements to the report but not necessarily to be endorsed as recommendations of the Commission.

The Chairman noted that three choices confronted the Commission in dealing with the supporting and supplementary material:

- 1) To do nothing with the studies;
- 2) To publish the studies
- 3) To abridge and publish them, but leaving them longer than the section in the Commission's report dealing with the individual topic.

The Chairman felt that time may not permit the rewriting of each of the reports and that publishing them in toto may not be desirable. He explained that the Office of Education will place them in the "ERIC" system, and as a result, they will be abstracted and lists of them will be widely distributed.

Dr. Fussler's view was that "ERIC" documentation, or the Clearinghouse kind of accessibility to reports is not entirely satisfactory. He felt that the Commission should be selective with the reports, publishing those of particular merit and ignoring those that are, in the opinion of the Commission, insubstantial, inconclusive or fragmentary. Such a package might well gain additional support from Congressmen or other executives for the first fifty pages of the report.

Mr. Ruggles agreed that the Commission should be selective in its publication of the research reports, but felt that some mention should be made of the entire number of studies and explanation offered as to why one report was reprinted while another was omitted. This explanation should attempt to remove any unfortunate implications that might result from inclusion or omission.

Other views supporting and disagreeing with the suggestions thus far were expressed, and a few additional schemes were forwarded. The Chairman concluded the discussion by suggesting that the Commission leave the question open for now and reconsider it at their October meeting when they will have firmed up their ideas on the principal report.

Publishing of Report: Authority, Ownership, Issuing Agency.

Dr. Burkhardt posed the question: "When we say 'publishing', what exactly do we mean?" Dr. Fussler inquired as to what freedom the Commission may or may not have to publish or distribute its report.

Mr. Ruggles explained that he had asked these questions of an aide of Commissioner Howe and a clear directive had been issued stating that the Commission's responsibility was to turn over the report to the President's Committee on Libraries which, in turn, will present it to the White House. The Commission then automatically dissolved, and being in dissolution, will have no responsibility regarding the report beyond this point. However, it would seem feasible, and perhaps expected, that the Commission might advise the White House regarding the Commission's recommendations for publishing and distributing the report.

The Chairman pointed out that the character of the document itself would depend heavily upon the audience for which it was intended. A compact report for the President or Congress would be far different from one intended for a wide public audience. He called for, and appeared to receive, a consensus of the meeting that the report be prepared for a distribution of twenty-five thousand copies or more.

Mr. Ruggles mentioned, too, that the research reports are technically the property of the Office of Education and that they may demand them prior to publication. He noted that such an event would clearly violate the principle of premature exposure. He asked for a ruling regarding such a request from the Office of Education or any other agency.

The Chairman called for a sense of the motion that all documents prepared for the Commission, whether in draft form, testimony, research reports, or any such material, be withheld from release without the prior consent of the Commission itself. On voice vote, this motion was approved.

On Establishing a Permanent Library Study and Research Agency.

Mr. Clapp recommended that the Commission endorse the establishment of permanent library coordinating agency. This agency should be as nearly independent as possible, though officially sanctioned and funded by the Federal government. The agency should represent to the fullest extent possible the taxpaying, the unofficial public. And, it should be able to convey its recommendations directly to the executive bodies or to the bodies responsible for the implementation of national library policy. These bodies are: The Congress of the United States, the national libraries and other members of the federal library and bibliographical system, the U. S. Office of Education, and other federal agencies, such as the Superintendent of Documents, the National Science Foundation, the Federal Clearinghouse, N.A.S.A., A.E.C. and others. Such recommendations would have no force of law, but would be only recommendations resulting from careful study and judgement. This agency would have as its focus, the National Library System. Their function would be twofold: first, to develop national library policy, and secondly, to issue continuing recommendations to insure that such policy is usefully executed.

Dr. Carter urged that any such recommendation clearly delineate between such a national library advisory agency and the Library of Congress, and insure that there is no confusion or conflict of activities of the two.

The Chairman felt that in talking about this topic there appears to be some confusion. Three different notions emerge: operating a national library, a national library administrative board, with power to set standards and make grants, and a national library advisory or policy agency. His view was that the concept really involves three different kinds of functions. One is the function of running a library. Another involves the operations that are currently conducted, in part, by the Office of Education. A third concept resembles a Board of Regents of a national library system, being a permanent body but one without authority either to administer a library or to grant funds, but simply to perceive problems and make recommendations to those who might implement them.

Consensus of the Commission.

By voice vote, approval was granted on the motion that the Executive Director of the N. A. C. L. be authorized to decline all requests for Commission reports, whether such requests originate from official agencies or from outside sources.

A consensus appeared to be gained on the motion that the report be prepared for an eventual distribution of twenty-five thousand copies or more.

A consensus appeared to be gained, with some modification, on a three part summation by Dr. Brodman:

1) It is the belief of the Commission that the library is a viable means for the future as well as for the present for the transfer of information and therefore should be strengthened and helped.


2) The Commission in one year is not going to be able to uncover all the problems, much less solve the problems, and therefore a continuing Commission, or similar body, is recommended.

3) The Library of Congress should be made de facto and de jure a national library in the true sense of the word.

October Meeting.

The Chairman requested that the staff lay before the Commission in October as much material in the form of statements that can be approved or disapproved in either partial reports, or drafts, as the intervening weeks will allow them, or the Commission to prepare. In amplifying his request, the Chairman stated that the Commission should be prepared in October to adopt many of the statements which shall ultimately be incorporated into the final report. And, that such statements approved in October can be incorporated in draft sections of the report for final review.

Approved by the Commission
at its ninth meeting on
October 9, 1967 in Washington,
D. C.


Douglas M. Knight, Chairman